arXiv:math/0210303v2 [math.DG] 9 Jun 2003

Fully nonlinear equations on Riemannian manifolds with negative curvature

Matthew J. Gursky   Jeff A. Viaclovsky*

May 1, 2002

1 Introduction

Let (M^n, g) be a compact, connected, n-dimensional Riemannian manifold, $n \geq 3$, and let the Ricci tensor and scalar curvature be denoted by Ric and R, respectively. For a symmetric tensor A, we let $\det(A)$ denote the determinant of A, that is, the product of the eigenvalues of A.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume that (M^n, g) has negative Ricci curvature. Then there exists a unique conformal metric $\tilde{g} = e^{2u}g$ with negative Ricci curvature satisfying*

$$\det(Ric_{\tilde{g}}) = \text{constant}. \tag{1.1}$$

By results of [3], [9], and [16], every compact manifold of dimension $n \geq 3$ admits a metric with negative Ricci curvature. Therefore we have

Corollary 1.1. *Every smooth compact n-manifold, $n \geq 3$, admits a Riemannian metric with $Ric < 0$ and*

$$\det(Ric) = \text{constant}. \tag{1.2}$$

This theorem may be viewed as a Monge-Ampère version of a theorem of Aubin for the scalar curvature ([1]). Theorem 1.1 is a special case of a more general theorem involving symmetric functions of eigenvalues of Ric, which we describe next. Let A be a symmetric $n \times n$ matrix, and let $\sigma_k(A)$ denote the kth elementary symmetric of A.

Definition 1. *Let $(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) \in \mathbf{R}^n$. We view the elementary symmetric functions as functions on $\mathbf{R}^n$*

$$\sigma_k(\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_n) = \sum_{i_1 < \cdots < i_k} \lambda_{i_1} \cdots \lambda_{i_k},$$

and we define

$$\Gamma_k^+ = \textit{component of } \{\sigma_k > 0\} \textit{ containing the positive cone.}$$

We also define $\Gamma_k^- = -\Gamma_k^+$.

---

*Supported in part by an NSF Postdoctoral Fellowship.

For a symmetric linear transformation $A : V \to V$, where V is an n-dimensional inner product space, the notation $A \in \Gamma_k^{\pm}$ will mean that the eigenvalues of A lie in the corresponding set. We note that this notation also makes sense for a symmetric tensor on a Riemannian manifold. If $A \in \Gamma_k^{+}$, let $\sigma_k^{1/k}(A) = \{\sigma_k(A)\}^{1/k}$, and if $A \in \Gamma_k^{-}$, let $\sigma_k^{1/k}(A) = -|\sigma_k(A)|^{1/k}$.

Let $t \in \mathbf{R}$, and define

$$A^t = \frac{1}{n-2}\left(Ric - \frac{t}{2(n-1)}Rg\right). \tag{1.3}$$

Note that for $t = 1$, A^1 is the classical Schouten tensor ([7]).

The following is our main theorem.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume that $A_g^t \in \Gamma_k^-$ for some $t < 1$, and let $f(x) < 0$ be any smooth function on M^n. Then there exists a unique conformal metric $\tilde{g} = e^{2w}g$ satisfying*

$$\sigma_k^{1/k}(A_{\tilde{g}}^t) = f(x). \tag{1.4}$$

Note that we take the elementary symmetric function with respect to the metric $\tilde{g}$. As noted previously in [18], the C^2 estimate does not work for $t = 1$, which is why we must make the restriction $t < 1$. Also, for $t > 1$, the equation is not necessarily elliptic, therefore $t = 1$ is critical for several reasons. It is an interesting problem to investigate the limiting behaviour of the solutions in Theorem 1.2 as $t \to 1$.

We next write this curvature equation as a partial differential equation. We have the following formula for the transformation of A^t under a conformal change of metric $\tilde{g} = e^{2w}g$:

$$\tilde{A}^t = A^t - \nabla^2 w - \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta w)g + dw \otimes dw - \frac{2-t}{2}|\nabla w|^2 g. \tag{1.5}$$

Since $A^t = A^1 + \frac{1-t}{n-2}tr(A^1)g$, this formula follows easily from the standard formula for the transformation of the Schouten tensor (see [18]):

$$\tilde{A}^1 = A^1 - \nabla^2 w + dw \otimes dw - (1/2)|\nabla w|^2 g. \tag{1.6}$$

From (1.5), we may write (1.4) with respect to the background metric g

$$\sigma_k^{1/k}\left(\nabla^2 w + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta w)g + \frac{2-t}{2}|\nabla w|^2 g - dw \otimes dw - A_g^t\right) = -f(x)e^{2w} > 0. \tag{1.7}$$

In the following sections we will derive a priori estimates for solutions of (1.7), culminating in the existence proof in Section 6. In Section 7, we make some remarks on the positive curvature case.

We also point out that the Hessian equation

$$\sigma_k^{1/k}(\nabla^2 w + S) = \Psi(x, w) \tag{1.8}$$

where S is a symmetric tensor was considered in [15], [6]. For a general existence theorem, one must assume that the background metric has non-negative sectional curvature. We emphasize that, because of special properties of (1.7), we do not need such an assumption.

1.1 Acknowledgements

A substantial part of the research for this paper was carried out while both authors were visiting the Forschungsinstitut für Mathematik at ETH, Zurich. The authors wish to acknowledge the generous support of the Institute, and the hospitality of Professor Michael Struwe. The authors would also like to thank Pengfei Guan for helpful suggestions.

2 Ellipticity

In this section we will discuss the ellipticity properties of equation (1.7).

Definition 2. *Let $A : V \to V$ be a symmetric linear transformation, where V is an n-dimensional inner product space. For $0 \leq q \leq n$, the q*th Newton transformation *associated with A is*

$$T_q(A) = \sigma_q(A) \cdot I - \sigma_{q-1}(A) \cdot A + \cdots + (-1)^q A^q.$$

Several useful identities involving the Newton tranformation and elementary symmetric polynomials were derived in [17]. First, if A^i_j are the components of A with respect to some basis of V, then

$$T_q(A)^i_j = \frac{1}{q!}\delta^{i_1 \ldots i_q i}_{j_1 \ldots j_q j} A^{j_1}_{i_1} \cdots A^{j_q}_{i_q}. \tag{2.1}$$

Here $\delta^{i_1 \ldots i_q i}_{j_1 \ldots j_q j}$ is the generalized Kronecker delta symbol, and we are using the Einstein summation convention. Also,

$$\sigma_k(A) = \frac{1}{k!}\delta^{i_1 \ldots i_k}_{j_1 \ldots j_k} A^{j_1}_{i_1} \cdots A^{j_k}_{i_k}. \tag{2.2}$$

We note that if $A : \mathbf{R} \to \mathrm{Hom}(V, V)$, then

$$\frac{d}{dt}\sigma_k(A(t)) = T_{k-1}(A(t))^i_j \frac{d}{dt} A(t)^j_i = T_{k-1}(A(t))^{ij} \frac{d}{dt} A(t)_{ij}, \tag{2.3}$$

that is, the $(k-1)$-Newton transformation is what we get when we differentiate σ_k. We also note the identities

$$\begin{aligned} T_{k-1}(A)^i_j A^j_i &= k\sigma_k(A), \\ trT_{k-1}(A) = T_{k-1}(A)^k_k &= (n-k+1)\sigma_k(A). \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

The following Proposition describes some important properties of the cones $\Gamma^{\pm}_k$, and their relation to the Newton transformations:

Proposition 2.1. *(i) Each set Γ^+_k is an open convex cone with vertex at the origin, and we have the following sequence of inclusions*

$$\Gamma^+_n \subset \Gamma^+_{n-1} \subset \cdots \subset \Gamma^+_1.$$

(ii) If the eigenvalues of A are in Γ_k^+ (resp., Γ_k^-), then T_{k-1} is positive (resp., negative) definite.
(iii) For symmetric linear transformations $A \in \Gamma_k^+$, $B \in \Gamma_k^+$, and $t \in [0,1]$, we have the following inequality

$$\{\sigma_k((1-t)A + tB)\}^{1/k} \geq (1-t)\{\sigma_k(A)\}^{1/k} + t\{\sigma_k(B)\}^{1/k}. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. The proof of this proposition is standard, and may be found in [4] and [10]. □

Note that the inequality (2.5) states that $\sigma_k^{1/k}$ is a *concave* function in Γ_k^+. This will be essential in proving the C^2 and $C^{2,\alpha}$ estimates in later sections.

Proposition 2.2. *If w is a solution of (1.7) with $A_g^t \in \Gamma_k^-$ for some $t \leq 1$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\nabla}^2 w \in \Gamma_k^+, \text{ where} \\ &\bar{\nabla}^2 w \equiv \nabla^2 w + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta w)g + \frac{2-t}{2}|\nabla w|^2 g - dw \otimes dw - A_g^t \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since M is compact, at a minimum of the solution w we have

$$\sigma_k^{1/k}\left(\nabla^2 w(p) + \frac{1-t}{n-2}\Delta w(p) g - A_g^t(p)\right) = -f(p)e^{2w(p)} > 0,$$

with $\nabla^2 w(p)$ positive semidefinite, and therefore $\nabla^2 w(p) + \frac{1-t}{n-2}\Delta w(p) g \geq 0$. From Proposition 2.1, we conclude that $\bar{\nabla}^2 w(p) \in \Gamma_k^+$. Since the cones are connected, by continuity we have $\bar{\nabla}^2 w \in \Gamma_k^+$. □

Proposition 2.3. *If $A_g^t \in \Gamma_k^-$ for some $t \leq 1$, then equation* (1.7) *is elliptic at any solution.*

Proof. We define

$$\begin{aligned} F_t[w, \nabla w, \nabla^2 w] = \sigma_k\Big(\nabla^2 w + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta w)g + \frac{2-t}{2}|\nabla w|^2 g - dw \otimes dw - A_g^t\Big) \\ - |f(x)|^k e^{2kw}, \end{aligned}$$

so that solutions of (1.7) are exactly the zeroes of F_t. We then suppose that $w \in C^2(M)$ satisfies $F_t[w, \nabla w, \nabla^2 w] = 0$. Define $w_s = w + s\varphi$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^t(\varphi) &= \frac{d}{ds} F_t[w_s, \nabla w_s, \nabla^2 w_s]\Big|_{s=0} \\ &= \frac{d}{ds}\left(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 w_s)\right)\Big|_{s=0} - \frac{d}{ds}\left(|f(x)|^k e^{2kw_s}\right)\Big|_{s=0}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

From (2.3), we have

$$\frac{d}{ds}\left(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 w_s)\right)\Big|_{s=0} = T_{k-1}(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)_{ij}(\bar{\nabla}^2 w_s)'_{ij}.$$

where

$$(\bar{\nabla}^2 w_s)' = \frac{d}{ds}\left(\bar{\nabla}^2 w_s\right)\Big|_{s=0}.$$

We compute

$$(\bar{\nabla}^2 w_s)' = \nabla^2\varphi + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta\varphi)g + (2-t)\langle dw, d\varphi\rangle g - 2dw\otimes d\varphi.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{ds}\left(\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 w_s)\right)\Big|_{s=0} = T_{k-1}(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)_{ij}\Big(&\nabla_i\nabla_j\varphi + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta\varphi)g_{ij} \\ &+ (2-t)\langle dw, d\varphi\rangle g_{ij} - 2w_i\varphi_j\Big).\end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

For the second term on the RHS of (2.6) we have

$$\frac{d}{ds}\left(|f(x)|^k e^{2kw_s}\right)\Big|_{s=0} = 2k|f(x)|^k e^{2kw}\varphi. \quad (2.8)$$

Combining (2.7) and (2.8), we conclude

$$\mathcal{L}^t(\varphi) = T_{k-1}(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)_{ij}(\nabla_i\nabla_j\varphi + \frac{1-t}{n-2}\Delta\varphi g_{ij}) - 2k|f(x)|^k e^{2kw}\varphi + \cdots \quad (2.9)$$

where $+\cdots$ denotes additional terms which are linear in $\nabla\varphi$. Defining

$$(Q_{k-1})_{ij} = (T_{k-1})_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(T_{k-1})_{ll}\delta_{ij}, \quad (2.10)$$

we have

$$\mathcal{L}^t(\varphi) = Q_{k-1}(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)_{ij}(\nabla_i\nabla_j\varphi) - 2k|f(x)|^k e^{2kw}\varphi + \cdots \quad (2.11)$$

By Propositions 2.1 and 2.2, $Q_{k-1}(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)_{ij} > 0$, so $\mathcal{L}^t$ is elliptic. □

Since the coefficient of φ in the zeroth-order term of (2.11) is strictly negative, we have

Corollary 2.1. *If $A_g^t \in \Gamma_k^-$ for some $t \le 1$, then at any solution of* (1.7)*, the linearized operator $\mathcal{L}^t : C^{2,\alpha}(M) \to C^{\alpha}(M)$ is invertible.*

3 C^0 estimate

We begin with an important property of σ_k in the cone Γ_k^+.

Lemma 3.1. *Let A and B be symmetric $n\times n$ matrices. Assume that A is positive semi-definite, $B \in \Gamma_k^+$, and $A+B \in \Gamma_k^+$. Then*

$$\sigma_k(A+B) \ge \sigma_k(B).$$

If A is negative semi-definite, then

$$\sigma_k(A+B) \le \sigma_k(B).$$

Proof. Let $F(t) = \sigma_k(tA + B) - \sigma_k(B)$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Note that from convexity of the cone Γ_k^+, we have $t(A + B) + (1 - t)B = tA + B \in \Gamma_k^+$. Using (2.3), we have

$$F'(t) = T_{k-1}(tA + B)^{ij} A_{ij} \geq 0,$$

since $T_{k-1}(tA + B)$ is positive definite from Proposition 2.1. Therefore $F(t)$ is non-decreasing, and $F(0) = 0$, so we have $F(1) = \sigma_k(A + B) - \sigma_k(B) \geq 0$. The negative case is similar. $\square$

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose $A_g^t \in \Gamma_k^-$ for some $t \leq 1$. Then there exist constants $\underline{\delta} < 0 < \overline{\delta}$ depending only upon f, A_g^t and k, such that for any solution $w(x)$ of* (1.7)*, we have $\underline{\delta} < w(x) < \overline{\delta}$.*

Proof. Since N is compact, at a minimum of the function $w(x)$ we have

$$\sigma_k^{1/k}\left(\nabla^2 w(p) + \frac{1-t}{n-2}\Delta w g(p) - A_g^t(p)\right) = -f(p)e^{w(p)}$$

with $\nabla^2 w(p)$ positive semidefinite, and therefore $\nabla^2 w(p) + \frac{1-t}{n-2}\Delta w g(p) \geq 0$. From Proposition 2.2 and Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\sigma_k^{1/k}(-A_g^t(p)) \leq -f(p)e^{w(p)},$$

and certainly we can choose $\underline{\delta}$ such that

$$w(x) \geq w(p) \geq \ln\left(\frac{\sigma_k^{1/k}(-A_g^t(p))}{-f(p)}\right) \geq \ln\left(\min_{x\in N}\frac{\sigma_k^{1/k}(-A_g^t(x))}{-f(x)}\right) > \underline{\delta}.$$

Similarly, if the maximum of $w(x)$ is at $q \in N$, we can choose $\overline{\delta}$ such that

$$w(x) \leq w(q) \leq \ln\left(\frac{\sigma_k^{1/k}(-A_g^t(q))}{-f(q)}\right) \leq \ln\left(\max_{x\in N}\frac{\sigma_k^{1/k}(-A_g^t(x))}{-f(x)}\right) < \overline{\delta}.$$

$\square$

4 C^1 estimate

Proposition 4.1. *Let w be a C^3 solution of (1.7) for some $t \leq 1$, satisfying $\underline{\delta} < w < \overline{\delta}$. Then $\|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty} < C_2$, where C_2 depends only upon $\underline{\delta}, \overline{\delta}, g, t$.*

We consider the following function

$$h = \left(1 + \frac{|\nabla w|^2}{2}\right)e^{\phi(w)},$$

where $\phi : \mathbf{R} \to \mathbf{R}$ is a function of the form

$$\phi(s) = c_1(c_2 + s)^p.$$

The constants c_1, c_2, and p will be chosen later. We will estimate the maximum value of the function h, and this will give us the gradient estimate.

Since N is compact, and h is continuous, we suppose the maximum of h occurs and a point $p \in N$. We take a normal coordinate system $(x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ at p. Then we have $g_{ij}(p) = \delta_{ij}$, and $\Gamma^i_{jk}(p) = 0$, where $g = g_{ij}dx^i dx^j$, and Γ^i_{jk} is the Christoffel symbol (see [2]).

Locally, we may write h as

$$h = \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} g^{lm} w_l w_m\right) e^{\phi(w)} = v e^{\phi(w)}.$$

In a neighborhood of p, differentiating h in the x^i direction we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i h = h_i &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_i (g^{lm} w_l w_m) e^{\phi(w)} + v e^{\phi(w)} \phi'(w) w_i \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\partial_i (g^{lm}) w_l w_m e^{\phi(w)} + g^{lm} \partial_i (w_l) w_m e^{\phi(w)} + v e^{\phi(w)} \phi'(w) w_i \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

Since in a normal coordinate system, the first derivatives of the metric vanish at p, and since p is a maximum for h, evaluating (4.1) at p, we have

$$w_{li} w_l = -v\phi'(w) w_i. \tag{4.2}$$

Next we differentiate (4.1) in the x^j direction. Since p is a maximum, $\partial_j \partial_i h = h_{ij}$ is negative semidefinite, and we get (at p)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \gg h_{ij} = &\frac{1}{2}\partial_j \partial_i g^{lm} w_l w_m e^{\phi(w)} + w_{lij} w_l e^{\phi(w)} + w_{li} w_{lj} e^{\phi(w)} + w_{li} w_l e^{\phi(w)} \phi'(w) w_j \\ &+ v_j e^{\phi(w)} \phi'(w) w_i + v e^{\phi(w)} (\phi'(w))^2 w_i w_j + v e^{\phi(w)} \phi''(w) w_j w_i + v e^{\phi(w)} \phi'(w) w_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

Next we note that $v_j = w_{lj} w_l$, and using (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \gg h_{ij} = &\frac{1}{2}\partial_j \partial_i g^{lm} w_l w_m e^{\phi(w)} + w_{lij} w_l e^{\phi(w)} + w_{li} w_{lj} e^{\phi(w)} \\ &+ (\phi''(w) - \phi'(w)^2) v e^{\phi(w)} w_i w_j + v e^{\phi(w)} \phi'(w) w_{ij}. \end{aligned}$$

We recall from Section 2 that

$$\bar{Q}^t_{ij} = \bar{T}_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \bar{T}_{ll} \delta_{ij}, \tag{4.3}$$

is positive definite, where $\bar{T}_{ij}$ means $T_{k-1}(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)_{ij}$.

So we divide by $ve^{\phi(w)}$, sum with $\bar{Q}^t_{ij}$, and we have the inequality

$$0 \geq \frac{1}{2v} \bar{Q}^t_{ij} \partial_i \partial_j g^{lm} w_l w_m + \frac{1}{v} \bar{Q}^t_{ij} w_{lij} w_l + (\phi''(w) - \phi'(w)^2) \bar{Q}^t_{ij} w_i w_j + \phi'(w) \bar{Q}^t_{ij} w_{ij}, \tag{4.4}$$

since $w_{li} w_{lj}$ is positive semidefinite.

We will use equation (1.7) to replace the w_{ij} term with lower order terms, and then differentiate equation (1.7) in order to replace the w_{lij} term with lower order terms. With respect to our local coordinate system, from (1.5) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij} =& - A^t_{ij} + w_{ij} - w_r \Gamma^r_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_{kk} - w_r \Gamma^r_{kk}) g_{ij} - w_i w_j \\ &+ \frac{2-t}{2}(g^{r_1 r_2} w_{r_1} w_{r_2}) g_{ij}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

At the point p, this simplifies to

$$\bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij} = -A^t_{ij} + w_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_{kk}) g_{ij} - w_i w_j + \frac{2-t}{2}(|\nabla w|^2)\delta_{ij}. \tag{4.6}$$

We write equation (1.7) in our local coordinate system

$$\sigma_k(g^{lj}(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)_{ij}) = |f(x)| e^{2kw}. \tag{4.7}$$

Note that the g^{lj} term is present since we need to raise an index on the tensor before we apply σ_k. From (4.6), we have at p,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{Q}^t_{ij} w_{ij} =& \bar{T}_{ij}\left(\bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij} + A^t_{ij} - \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta w) g_{ij} + w_i w_j - \frac{2-t}{2}(|\nabla w|^2)\delta_{ij}\right) \\ &+ \frac{1-t}{n-2}\Delta w \bar{T}_{ll} \\ =& \bar{T}_{ij}\left(\bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij} + A^t_{ij} + w_i w_j - \frac{2-t}{2}(|\nabla w|^2)\delta_{ij}\right).\end{aligned}$$

From the identities in (2.4), we have

$$\bar{T}_{ij}(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)_{ij} = k\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 w).$$

Therefore, using equation (4.7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{Q}^t_{ij} w_{ij} &= k\sigma_k(\bar{\nabla}^2 w) + \bar{T}_{ij}\left(A^t_{ij} + w_i w_j - \frac{2-t}{2}(|\nabla w|^2)\delta_{ij}\right) \\ &= k|f(x)|e^{2kw} + \bar{T}_{ij}\left(A^t_{ij} + w_i w_j - \frac{2-t}{2}(|\nabla w|^2)\delta_{ij}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Next we take m with $1 \leq m \leq n$, and apply ∂_m to (4.7)

$$\partial_m \left\{\sigma_k(g^{lj}\bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij})\right\} = \partial_m(|f(x)|e^{2kw}). \tag{4.9}$$

For the left side we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\partial_m \left\{\sigma_k(g^{lj}\bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij})\right\} = \bar{T}_{il}\partial_m(g^{lj}\bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij}) = \bar{T}_{il}\left(\partial_m g^{lj}\bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij} + g^{lj}\partial_m \bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij}\right)\\
&= \bar{T}_{il}\Bigg(\partial_m g^{lj}\bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij} + g^{lj}\partial_m\Bigg\{ - A^t_{ij} + w_{ij} - w_r\Gamma^r_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_{kk} - w_r\Gamma^r_{kk})g_{ij}\\
&\qquad\qquad - w_i w_j + \frac{2-t}{2}(g^{r_1r_2}w_{r_1}w_{r_2})g_{ij}\Bigg\}\Bigg)\\
&= \bar{T}_{il}\Bigg(\partial_m g^{lj}\bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij} + g^{lj}\Bigg\{ - \partial_m A^t_{ij} + w_{ijm} - w_{rm}\Gamma^r_{ij} - w_r\partial_m\Gamma^r_{ij}\\
&+ \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_{kkm} - w_{rm}\Gamma^r_{kk} - w_r\partial_m\Gamma^r_{kk})g_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_{kk} - w_r\Gamma^r_{kk})\partial_m g_{ij} - 2w_{im}w_j\\
&+ \frac{2-t}{2}\Big((\partial_m g^{r_1r_2})w_{r_1}w_{r_2}g_{ij} + 2g^{r_1r_2}w_{r_1m}w_{r_2}g_{ij} + g^{r_1r_2}w_{r_1}w_{r_2}\partial_m g_{ij}\Big)\Bigg\}\Bigg).
\end{aligned}$$

Evaluating this expression at p, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_m \left\{\sigma_k(g^{lj}\bar{\nabla}^2 w_{ij})\right\} = \bar{T}_{ij}\Bigg(&- \partial_m A^t_{ij} + w_{ijm} - w_r\partial_m\Gamma^r_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_{kkm} - w_r\partial_m\Gamma^r_{kk})g_{ij}\\
&- 2w_{im}w_j + (2-t)(w_{lm}w_l)g_{ij}\Bigg).
\end{aligned}\tag{4.10}$$

For the right hand side of (4.9) we have

$$\partial_m\left(|f(x)|e^{2kw}\right) = \partial_m|f(x)|e^{2kw} + 2k|f(x)|e^{2kw}w_m. \tag{4.11}$$

We have obtained the expansion of (4.9):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{T}_{ij}\Bigg(- \partial_m A^t_{ij} + w_{ijm} - w_r\partial_m\Gamma^r_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_{kkm} - w_r\partial_m\Gamma^r_{kk})\delta_{ij}\\
&\quad - 2w_{im}w_j - (2-t)v\phi'(w)w_m\delta_{ij}\Bigg) = (\partial_m|f(x)|)e^{2kw} + 2k|f(x)|e^{2kw}w_m.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.12}$$

Note that the third order terms in the above expression are

$$\bar{T}_{ij}\left(w_{ijm} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}w_{kkm}\delta_{ij}\right) = \bar{Q}^t_{ij}w_{ijm}.$$

Next we sum (4.12) with w_m, using (4.2) we have the following formula

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{Q}_{ij}w_m w_{ijm} + \bar{T}_{ij}\Bigg(&- w_m\partial_m A^t_{ij} - w_m w_r\partial_m\Gamma^r_{ij} - \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_r w_m\partial_m\Gamma^r_{kk})\delta_{ij}\\
&+ 2v\phi'(w)w_i w_j - (2-t)v\phi'(w)|\nabla w|^2\delta_{ij}\Bigg)\\
&= w_m(\partial_m f(x))e^{2kw} + 2k|f(x)|e^{2kw}|\nabla w|^2.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.13}$$

Substituting (4.8) and (4.13) into (4.4), we arrive at the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \geq\ & \frac{1}{2v}\bar{Q}^t_{ij}\partial_i\partial_j g^{lm} w_l w_m + (\phi''(w) - \phi'(w)^2)\bar{Q}^t_{ij} w_i w_j \\
&+ \frac{1}{v}\bar{T}_{ij}\Bigg(w_m \partial_m A^t_{ij} + w_m w_r \partial_m \Gamma^r_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_r w_m \partial_m \Gamma^r_{kk})\delta_{ij} - 2v\phi'(w) w_i w_j \\
&+ (2-t)v\phi'(w)|\nabla w|^2 \delta_{ij}\Bigg) + \frac{1}{v}\Big(w_m(\partial_m |f(x)|)e^{2kw} + 2k|f(x)|e^{2kw}|\nabla w|^2 \Big) \\
&+ \phi'(w)\left(k|f(x)|e^{2kw} + \bar{T}_{ij}\Big(A^t_{ij} + w_i w_j - \frac{2-t}{2}(|\nabla w|^2)\delta_{ij} \Big)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\bar{Q}^t_{ij} = \bar{T}_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}\bar{T}_{ll}\delta_{ij}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \geq\ & \Big(\phi''(w) - \phi'(w)^2 - \phi'(w)\Big)\bar{T}_{ij} w_i w_j \\
&+ \frac{1}{v}\bar{T}_{ij}\Bigg(\frac{1-t}{n-2}\partial_k\partial_k g^{lm} w_l w_m (\delta_{ij}/2) + \frac{1-t}{n-2} v(\phi''(w) - \phi'(w)^2)|\nabla w|^2 g_{ij} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\partial_i\partial_j g^{lm} w_l w_m + w_m \partial_m A^t_{ij} + w_m w_r \partial_m \Gamma^r_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_r w_m \partial_m \Gamma^r_{kk})\delta_{ij} \\
&+ v\phi'(w)A^t_{ij} + \frac{2-t}{2}v\phi'(w)|\nabla w|^2\delta_{ij}\Bigg) \\
&+ \frac{1}{v}\Big(w_m(\partial_m f(x))e^{2kw} + 2k|f(x)|e^{2kw}|\nabla w|^2 \Big) + \phi'(w)\left(k|f(x)|e^{2kw}\right). \qquad (4.14)
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.1. *At p, in normal coordinates, we have*

$$\sum_{l,m}(\partial_i\partial_j g^{lm} + 2\partial_l \Gamma^m_{ij})u_l u_m = 2\sum_{l,m} R_{iljm} u_l u_m,$$

where R_{iljm} are the components of the Riemann curvature tensor of g.

Proof. For the proof, see [18]. ☐

Using the lemma, and collecting terms in (4.14), we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}
0 \geq\ & \Big(\phi''(w) - \phi'(w)^2 - \phi'(w)\Big)\bar{T}_{ij} w_i w_j \\
&+ \bar{T}_{ij}\Bigg(\frac{1-t}{n-2} R_{klkm}\frac{w_l w_m}{v}\delta_{ij} + R_{iljm}\frac{w_l w_m}{v} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\phi''(w) - \phi'(w)^2)|\nabla w|^2 g_{ij} \\
&\qquad + \frac{w_m}{v}\partial_m A^t_{ij} + \phi'(w)A^t_{ij} + \frac{2-t}{2}\phi'(w)|\nabla w|^2\delta_{ij}\Bigg) \\
&+ \frac{1}{v}\Big(w_m(\partial_m f(x))e^{2kw} + 2k|f(x)|e^{2kw}|\nabla w|^2 \Big) + \phi'(w)\left(k|f(x)|e^{2kw}\right). \qquad (4.15)
\end{aligned}$$

Now we will choose $\phi(s)$.

Lemma 4.2. *Assume that* $\underline{\delta} < s < \overline{\delta}$*. Then we may choose constants* c_1, c_2*, and* p *depending only upon* $\underline{\delta}$*, and* $\overline{\delta}$*. so that* $\phi(s) = c_1(c_2 + s)^p$ *satisfies*

$$\phi'(s) > 0, \tag{4.16}$$

and

$$\phi''(s) - \phi'(s)^2 - \phi'(s) > 0. \tag{4.17}$$

Proof. We have

$$\phi'(s) = pc_1(c_2 + s)^{p-1},$$

and

$$\phi''(s) = p(p-1)c_1(c_2 + s)^{p-2}.$$

To satisfy (4.16) we need $c_1 > 0$, $p > 0$, and $c_2 + s > 0$. So choose $c_2 > \underline{\delta}$. Next we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi''(s) - \phi'(s)^2 - \phi'(s) &= p(p-1)c_1(c_2 + s)^{p-2} - (pc_1(c_2 + s)^{p-1})^2 - pc_1(c_2 + s)^{p-1} \\ &= pc_1(c_2 + s)^{p-2}\Big((p-1) - pc_1(c_2 + s)^p - (c_2 + s)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Now choose

$$c_1 = \frac{1}{p^2 \cdot \ \max\{(c_2 + s)^p\}},$$

and p so large that

$$\underline{\delta} < c_2 < -\overline{\delta} + p - 1 - \frac{1}{p}.$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\phi''(s) - \phi'(s)^2 - \phi'(s) &\geq \frac{1}{p \cdot \ \max\{(c_2 + s)^p\}}(c_2 + s)^{p-2}\Big(p - 1 - \frac{1}{p} - c_2 - s\Big) \\ &> \frac{1}{p \cdot \ \max\{(c_2 + s)^p\}}(c_2 + s)^{p-2}(\overline{\delta} - s) > 0.\end{aligned}$$

□

With $\phi(s)$ chosen as above, for $s \in [\underline{\delta}, \overline{\delta}]$, we let

$$\epsilon_1 = \min\{\phi'(s)\},$$

and

$$\epsilon_2 = \min\{\phi''(s) - \phi'(s)^2 - \phi'(s)\}.$$

From the inequality (4.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned}0 \geq \epsilon_2 \bar{T}_{ij} w_i w_j + \bar{T}_{ij}\Bigg(&\frac{1-t}{n-2} R_{klkm} \frac{w_l w_m}{v}\delta_{ij} + R_{iljm}\frac{w_l w_m}{v} \\ &+ \frac{w_m}{v}\partial_m A^t_{ij} + \phi'(w)A^t_{ij} + \Big(\frac{2-t}{2} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}\Big)\epsilon_1 |\nabla w|^2 \delta_{ij}\Bigg) \\ &+ \frac{1}{v}\Big(w_m(\partial_m f(x))e^{2kw} + 2k|f(x)|e^{2kw}|\nabla w|^2\Big) + \epsilon_1\left(k|f(x)|e^{2kw}\right). \qquad (4.18)\end{aligned}$$

If the matrix

$$\Big(\frac{1-t}{n-2}R_{klkm}\delta_{ij} + R_{iljm}\Big)\frac{w_l w_m}{v} + \frac{w_m}{v}\partial_m A^t_{ij} + \phi'(w)A^t_{ij} + \Big(\frac{2-t}{2} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}\Big)\epsilon_1 |\nabla w|^2 \delta_{ij} \tag{4.19}$$

has an eigenvalue less than 1, then the gradient estimate is immediate since the last term dominates ($\frac{2-t}{2} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} > 0$). Otherwise, absorbing lower order terms in (4.18), we have

$$C \geq \epsilon_2 \bar{T}_{ij} w_i w_j + \bar{T}_{ll}. \tag{4.20}$$

From (2.4) we obtain

$$\sigma_{k-1} \leq C.$$

Proposition 4.2. *Let $k \geq 2$, and $A \in \Gamma_k^+$ be a symmetric linear transformation. If $0 < c_1 \leq \sigma_k(A)$, and $\sigma_{k-1}(A) \leq c_2$, then we have a bound on the eigenvalues of A, that is, $|\lambda(A)| \leq C$, where C depends only on c_1 and c_2.*

Proof. The proof may be found in [15]. ☐

Using this result, if $k \geq 2$, we see that

$$|\lambda| \leq C,$$

and since $\bar{T}_{k-1}$ is positive definite, this implies (see [15])

$$\bar{T}^{ii}_{k-1} \geq \frac{1}{C} > 0, \text{ for } i = 1 \ldots n.$$

Equation (4.20) then implies that

$$|\nabla w|^2 \leq C.$$

Note that in the case $k = 1$, we do not require the proposition since $T_0^{ij} = \delta^{ij}$, and therefore (4.20) gives the gradient bound.

5 C^2 estimate

Proposition 5.1. *Let w be a C^4 solution of (1.7) for some $t < 1$ satisfying $\underline{\delta} < w < \overline{\delta}$, and $\|\nabla w\|_{L^\infty} < C_1$. Then $\|\nabla^2 w\|_{L^\infty} \leq C_2$, where C_2 depends only upon $\underline{\delta}, \overline{\delta}, C_1, g, t$.*

Let $S(TN)$ denote the unit tangent bundle of N, and we consider the following function $h : S(TN) \mapsto \mathbf{R}$,

$$h(e_p) = (\nabla^2 w + \Lambda|\nabla w|^2 g)(e_p, e_p),$$

where Λ is a constant to be chosen later. Since $S(TN)$ is compact, let h have a maximum at the vector $\tilde{e}_p$. We use normal coordinates at p, and by rotating, assume that the tensor is diagonal at p, and without loss of generality, we may assume that $\tilde{e}_p = \partial/\partial x^1$, and that $\nabla^2 w$ is diagonal at p.

We let $\tilde{h}$ denote the function defined in a neighborhood of p

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{h}(x) &= (\nabla^2 w + \Lambda|\nabla w|^2 g)(\partial/\partial x^1, \partial/\partial x^1) \\ &= (\nabla^2 w)_{11} + \Lambda|\nabla w|^2 \\ &= w_{11} - \Gamma^l_{11} w_l + \Lambda|\nabla w|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Differentiating in the ith coordinate direction, we obtain

$$\tilde{h}_i = w_{11i} - \partial_i \Gamma^l_{11} w_l - \Gamma^l_{11} w_{li} + \Lambda \partial_i g^{kl} w_k w_l + 2\Lambda g^{kl}(\partial_i w_k) w_l. \tag{5.1}$$

The function $\tilde{h}(x)$ has a maximum at p, so evaluating (5.1) at p, we obtain

$$w_{11i} = \partial_i \Gamma^l_{11} u_l + 2\Lambda w_{ik} w_k. \tag{5.2}$$

Next we differentiate (5.1) in the x^j direction. Since p is a maximum, $\partial_j \partial_i \tilde{h} = \tilde{h}_{ij}$ is negative semidefinite, and we get (at p)

$$\begin{aligned}0 \gg \tilde{w}_{ij} = w_{11ij} &- \partial_i \partial_j \Gamma^l_{11} w_l - \partial_i \Gamma^l_{11} w_{lj} - \partial_j \Gamma^l_{11} u_{li} \\ &+ \Lambda \partial_j \partial_i g^{kl} w_k w_l + 2\Lambda w_{ikj} w_k + 2\Lambda w_{ik} w_{kj}.\end{aligned}$$

We again recall from Section 2 that

$$\bar{Q}^t_{ij} = \bar{T}_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2} \bar{T}_{ll} \delta_{ij}, \tag{5.3}$$

is positive definite, where $\bar{T}_{ij}$ means $T_{k-1}(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)_{ij}$. We sum with $\bar{Q}^t_{ij}$ and we have the inequality

$$\begin{aligned}0 \geq &\bar{Q}^t_{ij} w_{11ij} - \bar{Q}^t_{ij} \partial_i \partial_j \Gamma^l_{11} w_l - 2\bar{Q}^t_{ij} \partial_i \Gamma^l_{11} w_{lj} + 2\Lambda \bar{Q}^t_{ij} \partial_j \partial_i g^{kl} w_k w_l \\ &+ 2\Lambda \bar{Q}^t_{ij} w_{ik} w_{kj} + 2\Lambda \bar{Q}^t_{ij} w_{ijk} w_k\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

We will use (4.10) to replace the last term, and we will differentiate equation (1.7) twice to replace the first term.

Using (4.10) and (4.11), we have at p,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{T}_{ij}\Big(-\partial_m A^t_{ij} - w_r\partial_m\Gamma^r_{ij} - \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_r\partial_m\Gamma^r_{kk})g_{ij} - 2w_{im}w_j + (2-t)(w_{lm}w_l)g_{ij}\Big) \\ + \bar{Q}^t_{ij}w_{ijm} = \partial_m|f(x)|e^{2kw} + 2k|f(x)|e^{2kw}w_m.\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

The next step is to rewrite the second derivative terms in terms of $\bar{\nabla}^2 w$. To further simplify notation, we let $\bar{w}_{ij} = (\bar{\nabla}^2 w)_{ij}$. We have

$$w_{ij} = \bar{w}_{ij} - \frac{1-t}{n-2}\Delta w\delta_{ij} - \frac{2-t}{2}|\nabla w|^2\delta_{ij} + w_iw_j + (A^t_g)_{ij}. \tag{5.6}$$

Since we are in the cone Γ^+_k, the trace is positive by Proposition 2.1, and since $\bar{w}_{11}$ is the largest eigenvalue, we have

$$|\bar{w}_{ii}| \leq (n-1)\bar{w}_{11}, \qquad i = 1\dots n. \tag{5.7}$$

Using (5.6) and (5.7), we may estimate (5.5)

$$\bar{Q}^t_{ij}w_{ijm}w_m \geq C + C\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + C\bar{w}_{11}\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}. \tag{5.8}$$

Inequality (5.4) may then be rewritten as

$$0 \geq \bar{Q}^t_{ij}w_{11ij} + C + C\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + C\bar{w}_{11}\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}. + \frac{2\Lambda(1-t)}{n-2}\bar{w}^2_{11}\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}. \tag{5.9}$$

We recall that the equation is

$$\sigma_k^{1/k}(\bar{\nabla}^2 w) = -f(x)e^{2w}.$$

To simplify notation, write $\sigma = \sigma_k^{1/k}$. Differentiating once in the x^1 direction, we have

$$\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial r_{ij}}(\partial_1(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)^i_j) = -f_1e^{2w} - 2fe^{2w}w_1.$$

Differentiating twice, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\partial_1\left(\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial r_{ij}}\right)(\partial_1(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)^i_j) + \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial r_{ij}}(\partial_1\partial_1(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)^i_j) \\ &= \Big(\frac{\partial^2\sigma}{\partial r_{ij}\partial r_{lm}}\Big)(\partial_1(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)^l_m)(\partial_1(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)^i_j) + \frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial r_{ij}}(\partial_1\partial_1(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)^i_j) \\ &= -f_{11}e^{2w} - 4f_1e^{2w}w_i - 4fe^{2w}w_1^2 - 2fe^{2w}w_{11}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\sigma_k^{1/k}$ is concave in Γ^+_k, we have the inequality

$$\bar{T}^{ij}_{k-1}\Big(\partial_1\partial_1(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)^i_j\Big) \geq (-f(x)e^{2w})^{k-1}(-f_{11}e^{2w} - 4f_1e^{2w}w_i - 4fe^{2w}w_1^2 - 2fe^{2w}w_{11}). \tag{5.10}$$

Using our assumptions, we have

$$\bar{T}^{ij}_{k-1}\Big(\partial_1\partial_1(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)^i_j\Big) \geq C + C\bar{w}_{11}. \tag{5.11}$$

We differentiate (4.5) twice, and evaluate at p to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_1\partial_1(\bar{\nabla}^2 w)_{ij} &= -A^t_{ij11} + w_{ij11} + 2w_{r1}\partial_1(\Gamma^r_{ij}) + w_r\partial_1\partial_1(\Gamma^r_{ij}) \\ &+ \frac{1-t}{n-2}(w_{kk11})g_{ij} + \frac{1-t}{n-2}w_{kk}\partial_1\partial_1(g_{ij}) \\ &- \frac{1-t}{n-2}(2w_{r1}\partial_1\Gamma^r_{kk} + w_r\partial_1\partial_1\Gamma^r_{kk}) - (w_{i11}w_j + 2w_{i1}w_{j1} + w_i w_{j11}) \\ &+ \frac{2-t}{2}\Big(\partial_1\partial_1 g^{r_1r_2}w_{r_1}w_{r_2}\delta_{ij} + 2(w_{r11}w_r + w_{r1}w_{r1})\delta_{ij} + |\nabla w|^2\partial_1\partial_1(g_{ij})\Big).\end{aligned}$$

From (5.2) we can replace terms of the form w_{11i} and we have

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{T}^{ij}_{k-1}\bar{w}_{ij11} = \bar{Q}^t_{ij}\bar{w}_{ij11} + \bar{T}^{ij}_{k-1}\Big\{ &- A^t_{ij11} + 2w_{r1}\partial_1(\Gamma^r_{ij}) + w_r\partial_1\partial_1(\Gamma^r_{ij}) \\ + \frac{1-t}{n-2}w_{kk}\partial_1\partial_1(g_{ij}) &- \frac{1-t}{n-2}(2w_{r1}\partial_1\Gamma^r_{kk} + w_r\partial_1\partial_1\Gamma^r_{kk}) + 4\Lambda w_{ik}w_k w_j - 2w_{i1}w_{j1} \\ + \frac{2-t}{2}\Big(\partial_1\partial_1 g^{r_1r_2}w_{r_1}w_{r_2}\delta_{ij} &- 4\Lambda w_{rm}w_m w_r\delta_{ij} + 2w_{r1}w_{r1})\delta_{ij} + |\nabla w|^2\partial_1\partial_1(g_{ij})\Big)\Big\}\end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Substituting (5.12) in (5.11), we have

$$\bar{Q}^t_{ij}w_{ij11} \geq C + C\bar{w}_{11} + C\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + C\bar{w}_{11}\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} - (2-t)\bar{w}^2_{11}\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}. \tag{5.13}$$

Next we substitute inequality (5.13) into (5.9) and we obtain

$$0 \geq C + C\bar{w}_{11} + C\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + C\bar{w}_{11}\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + \left(\frac{2\Lambda(1-t)}{n-2} - (2-t)\right)\bar{w}^2_{11}\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii}. \tag{5.14}$$

Since $t < 1$, we may choose Λ large to dominate the $-(2-t)$ term (this is the point where the assumption $t < 1$ is crucial). Choosing

$$\Lambda \geq \frac{n-2}{1-t}\left(1 + \frac{2-t}{2}\right),$$

we obtain

$$C + C\bar{w}_{11} + C\sum_i \bar{T}^{ii}_{k-1} + C\bar{w}_{11}\sum_i \bar{T}^{ii}_{k-1} \geq 2\bar{w}^2_{11}\sum_i \bar{T}^{ii}_{k-1}. \tag{5.15}$$

Dividing by $2\bar{w}^2_{11}$ and using (2.4), we obtain

$$\sigma_{k-1} \leq \Big(\frac{C_1}{\bar{w}^2_{11}} + \frac{C_2}{\bar{w}_{11}}\Big)\sigma_{k-1} + \frac{C}{\bar{w}^2_{11}} + \frac{C}{\bar{w}_{11}}. \tag{5.16}$$

If

$$\frac{C_1}{\bar{w}_{11}^2} + \frac{C_2}{\bar{w}_{11}} \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

then we have the necessary eigenvalue bound. So we may assume that

$$\frac{C_1}{\bar{w}_{11}^2} + \frac{C_2}{\bar{w}_{11}} \leq \frac{1}{2},$$

and substitution into inequality (5.16) yields

$$\frac{1}{2}\sigma_{k-1} \leq \frac{C}{\bar{w}_{11}^2} + \frac{C}{\bar{w}_{11}}.$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $\bar{w}_{11} \geq 1$, and from the above inequality we obtain

$$\sigma_{k-1} \leq C,$$

which by Proposition 4.2 yields the eigenvalue bound in the case $k \geq 2$. In the case $k = 1$, (5.16) already gives the eigenvalue estimate.

6 Proof of Theorem 1.2

In the previous sections we have demonstrated an a priori C^2 estimate for solutions of (1.7). Therefore (1.7) is uniformly elliptic with respect to any solution. It is straightforward to verify that (1.7) is a concave function of the second derivative variables. It follows from the work of Evans [8], and Krylov [13] that there exists a constant C such that for any solution w of (1.7) we have

$$\| w\|_{C^{2,\alpha}} < C.$$

For $s \in [0,1]$, we consider the equation

$$\begin{aligned} &\sigma_k^{1/k}\left(\nabla^2 w^s + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta w^s)g + \frac{2-t}{2}|\nabla w^s|^2 g - dw^s \otimes dw^s - H(s)\right) \\ &\quad = \Big(s|f(x)| + (1-s)\Big)e^{2w^s} > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

where $H(s) = sA_g^t - (1-s)\binom{n}{k}^{-1/k} g$. Define

$$S = \{s \in [0,1] : (6.1) \text{ has a solution } w^s \in C^{2,\alpha}\}.$$

It follows from Corollary 2.1 and the implicit function theorem (see [11]) that S is open. For $s = 0$, we have the solution $w \equiv 0$, therefore S is non-empty. Clearly, the estimates from the previous sections remain valid upon replacing A_g^t by $H(s)$, and

$|f(x)|$ by $s|f(x)| + (1-s)$. Consequently there exists a constant C independent of s such that

$$\| w^s \|_{C^{2,\alpha}} < C,$$

which implies that S is closed. From connectedness, $S = [0,1]$, therefore there exists a solution at $s = 1$.

Using the maximum principle as in Proposition 3.1, it follows that $w \equiv 0$ is the unique solution at $s = 0$. To prove uniqueness at $s = 1$, assume by contradiction that we have solutions w_1 and w_2 for $s = 1$. Then we may run the continuity method in reverse, starting at $s = 1$ and descending to $s = 0$. From the a priori estimates, we obtain 2 paths of solutions, one starting at w_1, and another starting at w_2. Since there is a unique solution at $s = 0$, the paths must coincide at some $s \geq 0$. This contradicts local invertibility.

7 Remarks on the positive curvature case

In this paper, we have concentrated on the case that $A_g^t \in \Gamma_k^-$, but it is also interesting to consider the case $A_g^t \in \Gamma_k^+$. This problem was studied in [18] for $t = 1$, where the compactness was reduced to an L^∞ estimate. The estimate proved in this paper also reduce the compactness to an L^∞ estimate for $-\infty < t \leq 1$.

For $f(x) > 0$, and background metric g with $A_g^t \in \Gamma_k^+$, we consider a conformal change of metric $\tilde{g} = e^{-2w} g$. Then (1.4) becomes

$$\sigma_k^{1/k}\left(\nabla^2 w + \frac{1-t}{n-2}(\Delta w) g - \frac{2-t}{2}|\nabla w|^2 g + dw \otimes dw + A_g^t\right) = f(x) e^{2w} > 0. \quad (7.1)$$

Note the gradient terms have a different sign now, but the estimates for higher derivatives still work. In particular, for the C^1 estimate, the only modification necessary is the following variant of Lemma 4.2

Lemma 7.1. *Assume that* $\underline{\delta} < s < \overline{\delta}$. *Then we may choose constants* c_1, c_2, *and* p *depending only upon* $\underline{\delta}$, *and* $\overline{\delta}$. *so that* $\phi(s) = c_1(c_2 + s)^p$ *satisfies*

$$\phi'(s) < 0, \quad (7.2)$$

and

$$\phi''(s) - \phi'(s)^2 - \phi'(s) > 0. \quad (7.3)$$

The proof given in Section 4 then works as before for all $t \leq 1$. For the C^2 estimate, using the following test function

$$h(e_p) = (\nabla^2 w + \Lambda |\nabla w|^2 g + dw \otimes dw)(e_p, e_p),$$

the estimate (5.14) becomes

$$0 \geq C + C\bar{w}_{11} + C\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + C\bar{w}_{11}\sum_i \bar{T}_{ii} + \left(\frac{2\Lambda(1-t)}{n-2} + (2-t)\right)\bar{w}_{11}^2 \sum_i T_{ii}. \quad (7.4)$$

The estimate now works for all $-\infty < t \leq 1$. Note we can include the endpoint $t = 1$ in the positive case.

We conclude with an outline of some progress that has been made for $t = 1$ in the positive case. For σ_2 in dimension 4, the L^∞ estimate has been proved (if M is not conformally equivalent to S^4) in Chang, Gursky and Yang (see [5]). Existence of solutions in the locally conformally flat case has been demonstrated in [14] and [12]. A sufficient condition for the L^∞ estimate in the determinant case may be found in [18].

References

[1] Thierry Aubin and Sophie Bismuth, *Courbure scalaire prescrite sur les variétés riemanniennes compactes dans le cas négatif*, J. Funct. Anal. **143** (1997), no. 2, 529–541. MR 98g:53067

[2] Arthur L. Besse, *Einstein manifolds*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.

[3] Robert Brooks, *A construction of metrics of negative Ricci curvature*, J. Differential Geom. **29** (1989), no. 1, 85–94. MR 90c:53099

[4] L. Caffarelli, L. Nirenberg, and J. Spruck, *The Dirichlet problem for nonlinear second-order elliptic equations. III. Functions of the eigenvalues of the Hessian*, Acta Math. **155** (1985), no. 3-4, 261–301.

[5] Alice Chang, Matt Gursky, and Paul Yang, *An a priori estimate for a fully nonlinear equation on four-manifolds*, preprint, 2001.

[6] Ph. Delanoë, *Hessian equations without zeroth-order term on compact non-negatively curved riemannian manifolds*, preprint (2001).

[7] Luther Pfahler Eisenhart, *Riemannian geometry*, Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1997, Eighth printing, Princeton Paperbacks.

[8] Lawrence C. Evans, *Classical solutions of fully nonlinear, convex, second-order elliptic equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **35** (1982), no. 3, 333–363. MR 83g:35038

[9] L. Zhiyong Gao and S.-T. Yau, *The existence of negatively Ricci curved metrics on three-manifolds*, Invent. Math. **85** (1986), no. 3, 637–652. MR 87j:53061

[10] Lars Gårding, *An inequality for hyperbolic polynomials*, J. Math. Mech. **8** (1959), 957–965.

[11] David Gilbarg and Neil S. Trudinger, *Elliptic partial differential equations of second order*, second ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983. MR 86c:35035

[12] Pengfei Guan and Guofang Wang, *A fully nonlinear conformal flow on locally conformally flat manifolds*, preprint, 2001.

[13] N. V. Krylov, *Boundedly inhomogeneous elliptic and parabolic equations in a domain*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat. **47** (1983), no. 1, 75–108. MR 85g:35046

[14] Aobing Li and YanYan Li, *On some conformally invariant fully nonlinear equations*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **334** (2002), no. 4, 305–310. MR 2002m:35054

[15] Yan Yan Li, *Some existence results for fully nonlinear elliptic equations of Monge-Ampère type*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **43** (1990), no. 2, 233–271. MR 91b:58269

[16] Joachim Lohkamp, *Metrics of negative Ricci curvature*, Ann. of Math. (2) **140** (1994), no. 3, 655–683. MR 95i:53042

[17] Robert C. Reilly, *On the Hessian of a function and the curvatures of its graph*, Michigan Math. J. **20** (1973), 373–383.

[18] Jeff A. Viaclovsky, *Estimates and existence results for some fully nonlinear elliptic equations on Riemannian manifolds*, to appear in Communications in Analysis and Geometry (2001).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, NOTRE DAME, IN 46556
E-mail Address: `mgursky@nd.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139
E-mail Address: `jeffv@math.mit.edu`